



1:20CR037



NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL. NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT.

**-FILED-**

Case no. 02D06-2001-F5-000030

JUL 13 2020

At \_\_\_\_\_ M  
ROBERT N. TRGOVICH, Clerk  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

**Affidavit of fact and response to complaint**

**Disclosure statement**

This Affidavit of fact and response to the complaint is not to be mistaken as a submission to jurisdiction nor is it proof or evidence of the recognition of the validity of any of the alleged claims and or complaints made by the plaintiff.

**Facts**

1. **A'zaam Walee Bey**, Natural Person, Ex. Rel. VANTRELL DESHAWN THOMAS aboriginal/ Indigene; In Propria Persona( and not Pro Se); Sui Juris Sui Heredes, In solo proprio, Non-Domestic, Non Resident and Non-Subject is of a Moroccan Descent which makes him of a Moorish State.
2. The Indiana State Trial Court lacks subject matter and personal jurisdiction for the reasons below.
  1. This Court, and all public offices, is defined under **FRCP Rule 40)** as a **FOREIGN STATE**; and as defined under **TITLE 28— JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE**. The Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA) of 1976 is a United States law, codified at Title 28 §§§ 1330, 1332, 1391, 1441(d) and 1602-1611, and is being jurisdictionally challenged, and "full disclosure" of the "true" jurisdiction of the Indiana State Trial Court has been challenged.
  2. Any failure to disclose the true jurisdiction is a violation of 15 Statutes at Large. For this was passed to remove the people of the United States of America from federal citizenship under the 14th amendment. Chapter 249 (Section I), enacted July 27, 1868.
  3. It is the Prosecutor's responsibility to prove a court has subject matter jurisdiction, and where a Prosecutor arbitrarily claims the court has jurisdiction, he is violating the defendant's right to due process of the law. It is, in fact, the prosecutor's responsibility to prove, on the record that jurisdiction exists, and jurisdiction can be challenged at any time, even years later, and even collaterally, as in a private III administrative process, as was done herein. It is the petitioner's right to challenge jurisdiction, and it is the plaintiff/prosecutor's duty to prove it exist.
  4. The law provides that once the State and Federal Jurisdiction has been challenged, it must be proven." **Main V. Thiboutot, 100 S. Ct. 2502 (1980);**
  5. "Once jurisdiction is challenged, it must be proven." **Hagans V. Lavine, 415 U.S. 533.**
  6. "Where there is absence of jurisdiction, all administrative and judicial proceedings are a nullity and confer no right, offer no protection, and afford no justification, and may be rejected upon direct attack." **Thompson V. Tolmie, 2 Pet. 157, 7 L. Ed. 381; Griffith V. Frazier, 8 Cr. 9, 3 L.Ed. 471.**
  7. "No sanctions can be imposed absent of proof of jurisdiction." **Standard V. Olsen, 74 S. Ct. 768; Title 5 U.S.C., Sec. 556 and 558(b).**
  8. "The proponent of the rule has the burden of proof." **Title 5 U.S.C., Sec. 556(d).**
  9. "Jurisdiction can be challenged at any time, even on final determination." **Basso V. Utah Power & Light Co., 495 2nd 906 at 910.**
  10. **When Jurisdiction challenges the act of a Federal or State official as being illegal, that official cannot simply avoid liability based on the fact that he is a public official. [United States V. Lee 106 U.S. 196, 220, 221, 1 S. CT 240, 261].**

"Whoever, having taken an oath before a competent tribunal, officer, or person, in any case in which a law of the United States authorizes an oath to be administered, willfully and contrary to such oath states or subscribes any material matter which he does not believe to be true, is guilty of perjury and shall be fined no more than \$2,000.00 or imprisoned not more than five years or both." 18 U.S.C. §1621

11. Void judgment under federal law is one in which rendering court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over a dispute or **jurisdiction over parties or acted in manner inconsistent with due process of law or otherwise acted unconstitutional in entering judgment, U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 5, Hays v. Louisiana Dock Co., 452 N.E. 2d 1383 (Ill App. 5 Dist. 1983)**

12. The Supreme Law of the Land is the United States Constitution.

a. The Indiana codes are statues for corporations (VANTRELL DESHAWN THOMAS) see **Annexure-Capitis Diminutio Maxima**

b. Meaning maximum loss of status through the use of capitalization e.g. JOHN DOE or DOE JOHN)- the highest or most comprehensive loss of status. This occurred when a man's condition was changed from one of freedom to one of bondage, when he became a slave. It swept away all rights of citizenship and all of family rights.

13. **Article III Section 1 of the U.S Constitution: the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress(executors), may from time to time ordain and established, therefore, it is the responsibility of the judge to show proof of his delegation of authority. If not proven, jurisdiction cannot be assumed, and a state judge cannot decide between two states.**

3. Therefore, the court must show proof of jurisdiction for which court lacks jurisdiction and cannot be proven because **A'zaam Walee Bey** Ex. Rel. VANTRELL DESHAWN THOMAS is of a Moorish State. The state does not have the authority to enter into any Treaty with another state. This matter must be heard in Federal court where diversity of citizenship and judicial questions are heard before the Federal Court.

4. The State of Indiana has 7 business days from the date of receipt (which is documented my certified mail) to rebut, point by point, the facts of this Affidavit. If the State of Indiana does not rebut in the time given, the State is subject to default in which any and all cases must be dismissed.

Thank You,

I Am:

**A'zaam Walee Bey**, Ex-Rel. <VANTRELL DESHAWN THOMAS>

Authorized Representative

Flesh and Blood Being, In Propria Persona

All Rights Reserved: U.C.C. 1-207/1-308; U.C.C.1-103

Northwest Amexem

